

SNC2D CCT Rubric - “Science-Fair Presentation”

Mr. Oldridge

Name: _____

Criteria	Level 1 (50-59%)	Level 2 (60-69%)	Level 3 (70-79%)	Level 4 (80-100%)
[K] Introduction – Background Information – Is there significant background information given?	Background information is scant. The objective of the experiment is not framed for the reader.	Introduction contains some background information, but not nearly enough for the experiment and objective to be fully understood.	Background includes good information, but not fully explanatory ... leaves something for the reader to figure out on their own.	Background serves as a thorough overview of information that a reader would need to understand the experiment and objective.
[I] Introduction – Objective and Research Question	There are traces of the objective/question scattered throughout the introduction, but it is not clear at all what question the experimenter is trying to answer.	The objective/question is too general. It is unclear what exactly the experimenter wants to learn about.	It is clear what the experimenter is interested in, but the objective/question is too general to figure out exactly what the experimenter will be doing.	It is abundantly clear what the experimenter wishes to determine by doing the experiment.
[I] Hypothesis	A hypothesis is put forward, but it does not address the research question or in “If...then...” format. The hypothesis is not supported by reasoning.	A specific “If...then...” hypothesis is put forward. The hypothesis is not supported by reasoning.	A specific “If...then...” hypothesis is put forward. The hypothesis answers the research question, but not directly. The hypothesis is supported by reasoning.	A specific “If...then...” hypothesis is put forward. The hypothesis directly answers the research question. The hypothesis is supported by reasoning.
[K] Materials	A partial list of items is included, but there are glaring omissions.	An almost-complete list of items used in the experiment is included, but a couple of items mentioned in the write-up are missing from the list.	A complete list of items used in the experiment is included, but <i>amounts</i> of measurable materials are not included.	A complete list of items used in the experiment is included, and <i>amounts</i> of measurable materials are also included.
[C] Procedure	The procedure includes most of the relevant steps, but is missing a couple of steps that obviously took place.	All relevant steps are included, but they are not specific enough to be reliably reproduced by another scientist.	All steps document specific, reproducible actions, but another scientist would have to figure a couple things out on his/her own.	All steps document specific, reproducible actions that another scientist could easily follow along with without having to make assumptions.
[A] Observations – Organization – Are your observations organized in an easy-to-read format (table)? Are rows, columns, and diagrams adequately labelled?	Observations show signs of disorganization, and the data is difficult to interpret.	Observations are organized, but are a little difficult to interpret.	Observations are easy to follow, but not without a couple of assumptions made by the reader.	Observations are easy to follow and labels leave no room for misinterpretation.

[A] Observations – Quality of Data – Did you measure both qualitative and quantitative data? Did you include units?	There is both qualitative and quantitative data, but the data itself is not useful to the experimenter or reader. Proper units are scant.	Qualitative and quantitative data are included but lack depth, and proper units are used most of the time.	Qualitative and quantitative data are included but lack depth, and proper units are used throughout.	High-quality qualitative and quantitative data are included, and proper units are used throughout.
[C] Discussion – Data Analysis	Data analysis is just a reiteration of all observations.	Data analysis is a reiteration of select observations, with a comment about trends that are present.	Data is <i>summarized</i> (not reiterated) in a graph, table or other easy-to-read format. Tables are not titled appropriately, graphs do not have proper axis titles, etc.	Data is <i>summarized</i> (not reiterated) in a graph, table or other easy-to-read format. Tables are titled appropriately, graphs have proper axis titles, etc.
[A] Discussion – Answering the Research Question	In sentence form, the experimenter makes comments related to the research question, but does not demonstrate how the data supports / refutes the comments.	In sentence form, the experimenter uses data analysis / observations loosely to make comments related to the research question, but direct links between data and the research question are not present.	In sentence form, the experimenter uses data analysis / observations to make statements that are true, but none relate directly to the research question.	In sentence form, the experimenter uses data analysis / observations to make statements relating directly to the research question.
[K] Conclusion	Research question is answered, but findings are not summarized. The hypothesis may or may not be mentioned.	Findings are summarized, research question is answered, but there is no mention of the hypothesis.	Findings are summarized, research question is answered and the hypothesis is mentioned but its support/refutation is not included.	Findings are summarized, research question is answered and the hypothesis' accuracy is analysed.
[C] Presentation – Basics	Poorly timed OR unprofessional lecture slides OR very poor presentation skills, but an effort was made.	Well-timed. Lecture slides are semi-professional. Eye contact with audience is scant, and the speaker lacks poise.	Well-timed. Lecture slides are professional. Some eye contact with audience, and the speaker is confident, but does not seem knowledgeable in answering questions.	Well-timed. Lecture slides are professional. Eye contact with audience is maintained, and the speaker comes across as knowledgeable. Answers any questions thoroughly.
[C] Presentation – Scientific Demanour	Introduction, research question, results and the research question's answer are presented, but each lacks clarity / conviction / thoroughness.	Introduction is not very informative. Research question is clearly presented. Results are presented, and research question is answered, but neither are done particularly clearly.	Informative introduction. Research question is clearly presented. Results are presented but are not easily read. Research question is answered.	Informative introduction. Research question is clearly presented. Results are presented in an easy-to-read format. A strong concluding statement answers the research question.